

Appln. No. 10/687,384

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1868

**II. Remarks**

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested. Claims 1-26 remain pending.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicant respectfully acknowledges the examiners indication that claims 7-10, 12, and 21-24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e)***

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,728,615 to Yao, et al. (Yao)

The examiner relies on Yao to reject claims 1-26. Applicants respectfully submit that Yao was assigned or under the obligation to be assigned to Visteon Global Technologies, Inc., the assignee of the instant application at the time of the invention. (Reel 013731, Frame 0806, recorded February 3, 2003) Therefore, Yao is unavailable to limit the patentability of claims 1-26 as defined by 35 U.S.C. §103(c). Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-26.

Appln. No. 10/687,384

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1868

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)*

Claims 11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,728,615 to Yao (Yao) in view of U.S. Patent 6,219,604 to Dilger et al (Dilger).

Claims 15-19, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,728,615 to Yao (Yao) in view of U.S. Patent 6,389,343 to Hefner, et al. (Hefner).

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,728,615 to Yao (Yao) in view of U.S. Patent 6,389,343 to Hefner, et al. (Hefner) and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,681,881 to Andonian, et al. (Andonian).

As noted above, Yao is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(c), and, as admitted by the examiner, Dilger, Hefner, and Andonian alone do not teach or suggest all the elements of claims 11, 13-20, 25, and 26. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

*Conclusion*

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of


Appln. No. 10/687,384

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1868

record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: July 11, 2005

  
Robert K. Fergan  
Reg. No.: 51,674  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60610  
(734) 302-6000